UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/726,449	12/02/2003	Dimitre Hristov Hristov	2003P11789US	6754	
7590 06/28/2007 Siemens Corporation			EXAMINER		
Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South			LEE, SHUN K		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Iselin, NJ 0883	0		2884		
					
	•	•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/28/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/726,449	HRISTOV ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Shun Lee	2884

Refere the Filing of an Annual Priof	,				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Shun Lee	2884			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 June 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.			
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:					
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN					
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	06.07(f).				
nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ee appeal. Since		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	• •				
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying .	the issues for		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).		
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the		
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of		
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>10-18,20,22,23 and 25-30</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a N ind sufficient reasons why the affidation	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> rit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a		
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	•		•		
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	01.	_		
13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.		[1] [M]			
		11/1/100			
		DAVED DODTA			
	CHIE	DAVIÓ PORTA	11110		
read access to be seen		ISORY PATENT EXAN			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons discussed in the previous office action.

Continuation of 13. Other: applicant argues (third to fifth paragraphs on pg. 2 of remarks filed 18 June 2007) that the final rejection is premature since it introduced a new ground of rejection in regard at least to pending claim 10. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Pending claim 10 was amended to incorporate limitations recited in canceled claim 19. Thus pending claim 10 is in essence canceled claim 19. It is noted that canceled claim 19 was rejected (see pp. 5-6 of office action mailed 19 October 2005) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrillo in view of Pochwalski. Pending claim 10 was rejected (see pp. 3-5 of office action mailed 19 October 2005) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrillo in view of Pochwalski. Thus pending claim 10 was rejected on the same grounds as canceled claim 19. Therefore any new ground of rejection was necessitated by Applicant's amended or new claims. In addition, applicant states (last paragraph on pg. 2 of remarks filed 18 June 2007) that there was no intention of changing representative information. However, the power of attorney filed 2 December 2003 named a list of patent practitioners as representative whereas the Supplemental Application Data Sheet attempts to change the representative information by naming patent practitioners associated with a Customer Number as representative. An application data sheet cannot be used to revoke a power of attorney and/or grant a new power of attorney. Further, 37 CFR 1.76(c)(2) requires that a Supplemental Application Data Sheet must identify the information that is being changed, preferably with underlining for insertions and strike-through for text removed.